

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection to the claims and seeks reconsideration thereof. Claims 4-7 are now pending in the instant application. In this response, Claims 1-3 have been cancelled, Claims 6 and 7 have been added and no claims have been amended.

The instant application provides a slot array antenna, comprising broadband slot antennas, wherein each of the broadband slot antennas includes, a dielectric layer under which a microstrip feedline is formed; a ground formed on the dielectric layer and electromagnetically coupled with the microstrip feedline through a slot; and a reflection plane placed under the microstrip feedline in order to prevent board surface waves from being radiated and enhance antenna gain, wherein a baffle layer is formed on the ground conductor in order to prevent mutual coupling between the slot antennas and enhance antenna gain.

I. Claim Amendments

Applicant respectfully submits the attached Amendments to the Claims in which Claims 6 and 7 have been added. Claim 6 depends from Claim 4 and recites wherein the area of an entrance of the slot is the same as that of a bottom of the slot or area of the entrance of the slot is different from that of the bottom of the slot. Support for Claim 6 may be found, for example, in original Claim 2. Claim 7 depends from Claim 4 and recites wherein the reflection plane is a metal resonator. Support for Claim 7 may be found, for example, in original Claim 3. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the attached Amendments to the Claims are supported by the specification and do not add new matter. Applicant respectfully requests consideration and entry of Claims 6 and 7.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,507,321 issued to Oberschmidt et. al. (“Oberschmidt”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,342,864 issued to Muramoto et. al. (“Muramoto”).

Claims 1-3 are cancelled in the instant response therefore the Examiner's rejections with respect to these claims is moot.

In regard to new Claims 6 and 7, Claims 6 and 7 depend from Claim 4 and incorporate the limitations thereof. The Examiner indicates in the Office Action that Claim 4 is allowed. Thus, for at least the reason that Claims 6 and 7 depend from an allowed base claim, these claims are not *prima facie* obvious over Oberschmidt in view of Muramoto. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and entry of Claims 6 and 7.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of Claims 4 and 5.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely Claims 4-7, are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Questions regarding this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 3/8/06

By: [Signature]

Eric S. Hyman
Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on 3/8, 2006.

[Signature]
Jean Svoboda